

United States Patent and Trademark Office

MAK

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,287	01/14/2002	Masakazu Ogasawara	041514-5212 5436 EXAMINER	
9629	7590 09/26/2005			
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			AGUSTIN, PETER VINCENT	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2652	
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	10/043,287	OGASAWARA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Peter Vincent Agustin	2652			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133):			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Sec</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,9-14 and 18-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4-8 and 15-17 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers	·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange and the correction of the correction of the orange and the ora	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Claims 1-20 are now pending.
- 2. Applicant's arguments in the response After Final filed September 7, 2005 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the finality of the Office Action mailed January 12, 2005 has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 11 is objected to because on the last line, "recordation" should be --recording--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1, 2, 12 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohba (US 5,892,744).

In regard to claim 1, Ohba discloses an optical pickup device (Figure 5) driven by an error signal (output of element 12) comprising: a grating element (11) for receiving a light beam to create zero order diffracted light, \pm first order diffracted light and \pm second order diffracted light when the light beam passes through the grating element (column 4, lines 57-60; column 5, lines 19-22); an optical system (101, 102, 10, 52 & 103) for focusing the zero order, \pm first order and \pm second order diffracted light on a recording surface of an optical recording medium (70) so as to form a spot (Figure 8, middle spot) of the zero order diffracted light on a first track (middle shaded track, which is a "land track") extending on the recording surface, spots (first and last

Application/Control Number: 10/043,287 Page 3

Art Unit: 2652

spots) of the ± second order diffracted light on tracks adjacent to the first track (two non-shaded tracks, which are "groove tracks"), and spots (second and fourth spots) of the ± first order diffracted light between the spot of the zero order diffracted light and the spots of the ± second order diffracted light; and an optical detector (Figure 6, element 14) having first to fifth independent light-receiving elements (40, 41, 42, 43 & mislabeled 43), the first light-receiving element (40) being adapted to receive returning light from the spot of the zero order diffracted light, the second (41) and third (42) light-receiving elements being adapted to receive returning light from the spots of the ± first order diffracted light, and the fourth (43) and fifth (43) light-receiving elements being adapted to receive returning light from the spots of the ± second order diffracted light, to produce output signals used to create an error signal (column 5, lines 45-51).

In regard to claim 2, Ohba discloses that the first light-receiving element (40) includes four independent light-receiving portions adjacent to each other and partitioned by two division lines intersecting each other perpendicularly, one of the division lines being parallel to a track extending direction (as shown in Figure 6).

Claims 12 & 13 have limitations similar to those of claims 1 & 2; thus, they are rejected on the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 3 & 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,287

Art Unit: 2652

For a description of Ohba, see the rejection above. However, in regard to claim 3, Ohba does not explicitly disclose that each of the second to fifth light-receiving elements includes at least two independent light-receiving portions adjacent to each other and partitioned by a division line extending substantially parallel to a track extending direction.

Official Notice is taken that both the concept and the advantages of light-receiving elements having at least two independent light-receiving portions adjacent to each other and partitioned by a division line extending substantially parallel to a track extending direction are notoriously old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the Applicant to have used light-receiving elements having at least two independent light-receiving portions adjacent to each other and partitioned by a division line extending substantially parallel to a track extending direction for the second to fifth light-receiving elements of Ohba, the motivation being to more accurately detect position errors of an optical pickup.

Claim 14 has limitations similar to those of claim 3; thus, it is rejected on the same basis.

8. Claims 9 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba in view of Alon (US 5,959,953).

For a description of Ohba, see the rejection above. However, in regard to claim 9, Ohba does not disclose a crosstalk cancellation circuit connected with the first, fourth and fifth light-receiving elements for reducing an amount of crosstalk in the output signal from the first light-receiving element and originating from signals from adjacent tracks, based on the output signals from the fourth and fifth light-receiving elements.

Art Unit: 2652

Alon discloses a crosstalk cancellation circuit (Figure 2, element 33; Figure 7; column 10, lines 58-61) for reducing an amount of crosstalk in the output signal from a first light-receiving element (Figure 3A, element 50) and originating from signals from adjacent tracks (column 10, line 58 thru column 11, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the Applicant to have applied the teachings of Alon to the device of Ohba, the motivation being to compensate for crosstalks resulting from magnification errors caused by track pitch variations (column 3, lines 32-37).

Claim 18 has limitations similar to those of claim 9; thus, it is rejected on the same basis.

9. Claims 10, 11, 19 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba in view of Imada et al. (US 5,404,344).

For a description of Ohba, see the rejection above. However, Ohba does not disclose: in regard to claim 10: an optical element for astigmatizing at least the returning light from the spot of the zero order diffracted light; and in regard to claim 11: that the optical element is a cylindrical lens positioned in an optical path of the returning light of the zero order diffracted light such that a center axis of the cylindrical lens extends at an angle of 45° to a track extending direction on the optical recordation medium.

Imada et al. disclose an optical element (Figure 2, element 7) for astigmatizing at least a returning light from a spot of a zero order diffracted light (see elements 8 & 9), wherein the optical element is a cylindrical lens positioned in an optical path of the returning light of the zero order diffracted light such that a center axis of the cylindrical lens extends at an angle of 45° to a track extending direction on an optical recordation medium (as shown in Figure 2; see also column 4, lines 10-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2652

of the invention by the Applicant to have applied the teachings of Imada et al. to the device of Ohba, the motivation being to provide astigmatism necessary to detect an error signal, thereby achieving accurate positioning of an optical head (column 2, lines 50-57).

Claims 19 & 20 have limitations similar to those of claims 10 & 11; thus, they are rejected on the same basis.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4-8 & 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See the Office Action mailed May 14, 2004 for a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 7, 2005, with respect to the Noda et al. (US 5,123,003) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the previous rejections based on this reference have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Ohba (US 5,892,744).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Vincent Agustin whose telephone number is 571-272-7567. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Thi Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,287

Art Unit: 2652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter Vincent Agustin Art Unit 2652

> BRIAN E. MILLER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 7